

**From:** drupal\_admin <drupal\_admin@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 04, 2016 4:27 PM  
**To:** HarborComments  
**Subject:** Harbor Comments

Submitted on 09/04/2016 6:27PM

Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)

Your Email: (b) (6)

Your Comments:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have rowed and fished the affected river miles for more than 30 years. EPA's preferred alternative is unacceptable because (among other reasons) it does not achieve healthy fish populations, instead planning to rely on continued health risk warnings.

The only acceptable alternative is G. The businesses that benefitted by ignoring, dumping, and inappropriately disposing of waste products over the decades are responsible for funding an adequate cleanup. We all understand that an adequate cleanup does not and could not achieve "0" contaminants. But to be acceptable, the level of contamination remaining after cleanup must allow all usual public uses of the waterway and banks, without need for limitations on exposure or health warnings. None of the other alternatives achieve this.

It is EPA's responsibility to see that cleanup achieves public goals, and that cleanup is funded by all Responsible Parties. Please reject Alternative I and work within the framework set by "G".